

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 14-18 and 20-29 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 8 is canceled, and claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, and 18 are amended, and claims 26-29 are added. No new matter is added.

Applicants wish to express their appreciation to Examiner Ghee and Primary Examiner Wallerson for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the personal interview held on November 12, 2003. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

I. Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,012,083 to Savitzky et al. (Savitzky) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0011806 A1 to Shiohara; rejects claims 3, 5, 7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky in view of Shiohara and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,134,568 to Tonkin;; rejects claims 4, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky in view of Shiohara and Tonkin, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,012,070 to Cheng et al. (Cheng); rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky in view of Shiohara, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,524,085 to Bellucco et al. (Bellucco); rejects claims 12, 16-19, 21-22 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonkin in view of Shiohara; and rejects claims 14 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonkin in view of Shiohara, and further in view of Bellucco. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 12, 18 and 26 include the features recited in canceled claim 8. Applicants respectfully submit that references relied on by the Office Action are insufficient to disclose or teach the claimed invention, as recited in claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 14-18 and 20-29.

In particular, Savitzky, Shiohara, Tonkin, Cheng and Bellucco, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest displaying plural printer routing options being a service bureau for printing as recited in claims 1, 3-7, 9-11 and 23. The cited references also fail to disclose or suggest displaying plural printer routing options being the Internet print request, as recited in claims 12, 14-18, 20-22 and 24-29.

The Office Action admits, on pages 7-8, that Savitzky, Shiohara and Tonkin do not disclose the method of displaying plural printer routing options, one of the routing options being the service bureau. However, the Office Action attempts to overcome the admitted deficiencies of Savitzky, Shiohara and Tonkin by arguing that Cheng teaches displaying the plural printer routing option, where one of the routing options is the service bureau.

However, Cheng merely discloses allowing an end user to create, using low resolution graphics, customized business forms or brochures at a users station on a video monitor, and then receiving such forms or brochures in an electronic format at a printing facility, so that it is not necessary for the end user to transport physical documents, especially documents with high resolution color graphics, to a printing facility. See col. 4, lines 29-35. However, Cheng fails to disclose or suggest displaying plurality of printer routing options where one of the routing options is the service bureau. In fact, Cheng discloses only a single print job order to the print facility.

Further, the Office Action states that Cheng discloses displaying a plurality of printer routing options and directs Applicant to col. 5, line 46 - col. 6, line-13. However, Applicants respectfully submit that col. 5, line 46 - col. 6, line 13 fail to disclose or even mention displaying plurality of printer routing options where one of the routing options is the service bureau for printing, as recited in claims 1, and similarly recited in claims 12, 18 and 26.

Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Cheng with the teachings of Savitzky, Shiohara and Tonkin with any expectation

of success. That is, nowhere in Cheng is there any motivation to modify the disclosure of Savitzky, Shiohara and Tonkin in the manner asserted by the Office Action as Cheng discloses only a single print job order. In the absence of any motivation to do so, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the references and the modified the resulting combination as asserted in the Office Action to obtain the claimed invention.

For at least these reasons, Savitzky, Shiohara, Tonkin, Cheng and Bellucco, either alone or in the various asserted combination, fail to disclose, teach or even suggest all of the features recited in claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 14-18 and 20-25. Thus, the various asserted combination of Savitzky, Shiohara, Tonkin, Cheng and Bellucco, fail to render obvious the subject matter of claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 14-18 and 20-25. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 14-18 and 20-25 based on Savitzky, Shiohara, Tonkin, Cheng and Bellucco and the various asserted combination of these references are respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 14-18 and 20-29 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

David J. Cho
Registration No. 48,078

JAO:DXC/brc

Date: November 21, 2003

Attachment:
Amendment Transmittal

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037
--